

## **REMARKS**

The present application has pending claims 1-7.

Applicants' Attorney, the undersigned, wishes to thank Examiner Patel for the courtesy extended during the telephone interview of August 24, 2007 during which issues related to the July 26, 2007 Communication were discussed.

Particularly, during such interview it was discussed that the July 26, 2007 Communication incorrectly alleges that the April 30, 2007 Amendment raise new issues that would require broadening the search field. During the interview Examiner Patel acknowledged that the search field was not broadened by the April 30, 2007 amendment being that the Amendment simply clarified the language in the claims so as to more clearly recite a feature encompassed by the originally filed claims, said feature should have been already considered by the Examiner.

For example, the claims as originally filed recite a first logical unit being related to a first logical unit number and a second logical unit being related to a second logical unit number and that mapping is performed so as to set forth relations between the logical units. As pointed to Examiner Patel during the interview, the original claims encompassed features where the first and second logical unit numbers are different from each other, the same as each other or simply related to each other since such features at that time were not specified in the claims. The original search conducted by Examiner Patel should have encompassed such features since at the time such claims were filed these features were not specified.

The April 30, 2007 Amendment simply clarified that the first and second logical unit numbers are different from each other and become related by the mapping. Thus, the amendment of the claims as set forth in the April 30, 2007 Amendment simply causes the claims to more clearly recite one of the embodiments encompassed by the original claims. Therefore, the April 30, 2007 Amendment did not amend the claims in a manner which would have caused the search field to be broadened since the search field should have encompassed an embodiment where the first and second logical unit numbers are different, the same or related.

In order fully understand the above, the Examiner's attention is directed to MPEP §708.02(VIII)(A) which states that "the Examiner's search will be restricted to the subject matter encompassed by the claims". Applicants submit that the claims encompassed embodiments where the first and second logical unit numbers can be different, the same or related.

MPEP §708.02(VIII)(C) states that a reply to an Office Action "to be proper, must be restricted to the rejections, objections and requirements made. Any amendment which would require broadening the search field will be treated as an improper reply".

Applicants submit that the April 30, 2007 Amendment was restricted to the rejections set forth in the Office Action being that the Examiner referred to an alleged teaching of logical unit numbers in the cited reference Ofer (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,059). In response to this rejection Applicants amended the claims by the April 30, 2007 Amendment so as to more clearly describe that the first and second logical unit numbers according to the present invention are different from each other and become related by the mapping. Thus, the

amendment was restricted to the rejection set forth in the Office Action and simply clarified the claims to more clearly recite an embodiment which is encompassed by the originally filed claims. Therefore, the field of search was not broadened by the April 30, 2007 Amendment.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the April 30, 2007 Amendment be entered and that examination proceed based on said Amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 1-7 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1-7 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (1309.43490X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



---

Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc  
(703) 684-1120